

**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No.: 10/575,377 First Named Applicant: Osmo SUOVANIEMI  
 Examiner: B. R. GORDON Art Unit: 1797 Status of Application: Pending

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Brian Gordon (2) John Sanders  
 (3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: Sept. 28, 2010 Proposed Time: 10:00 AM/PM

**Type of Interview Requested:**

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Restriction Reqmt.</u>	<u>12-21</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>112, 1st and 2nd rejection</u>	<u>1-11</u>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>102/103 rejs.</u>	<u>1-11</u>	<u>Berteloot; Bergissor; Rainin</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

**Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:**

Please see the attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE:** This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

John R. Sanders, Jr.  
 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

John R. Sanders, Jr.

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

60166

Registration Number, if applicable

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner/SPE Signature

Application Ser. No. 10/579,740  
Applicant Initiated Interview Continuation Sheet

Applicant's representative requests to discuss in more detail with the Examiner the claim language used to describe the invention with respect to the related supportive sections of the instant specification, especially in light of potential translation-related misinterpretations (e.g. "response" versus "flange") and to hopefully expedite prosecution. Further, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's assistance in reviewing the application with the representative to clarify the amendments and their intent for reciting a claim scope based on the support found in the specification and the detailed drawings when viewed in their entirety from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's position regarding the lack of a specific recitation of "primary" and "secondary" in the specification. The primary and secondary means recited in the claims are an attempt to clarify that a secondary energy source is being provided for the emptying movement apart from a first energy source causing the suction movement. These features are supported in the specification as can be discussed in more detail during the interview with respect to claims 12-21, discussed below. Although it is not required that the specific wording of the claim language have literal or verbatim support in the specification, since this matter relates to 112, sixth paragraph, the issue appears more complicated.

In view of these considerations, claims 12-21 were prepared without means-plus-function limitations to allow Applicant to describe details regarding the actual mechanical components of the invention as supported by the application disclosure. It was not Applicant's intent to recite an invention distinct or restrictable from the original claims. Furthermore, the foreign origin of the application may conflict with the U.S.-specific understanding of means limitations under 112, sixth paragraph. Applicant believes more descriptive limitations such as those in claims 12-21 can avoid the issue entirely and move prosecution forward.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider claims 12-21 for further prosecution entirely instead of claims 1-11, which Applicant proposes to cancel if an agreement can be reached. Applicant additionally requests discussing with the Examiner specific wordings of the features of the new claims in more detail with respect to the applied prior art.